UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,823	07/23/2003	Scott Goldthwaite	WS-102	7792
27769 AKC PATENT	590 04/13/2009		EXAMINER	
215 GROVE ST NEWTON, MA			HANNON, CHRISTIAN A	
NEW ION, MA	1 02400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/625,823	GOLDTHWAITE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
CHRISTIAN A. HANNON	2618	

	CHRISTIAN A. HANNON	2618					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on 16 February 2009. A be the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), of appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply 	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disr	nissal of the				
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**	de alman an almandificio a Al	an innuna fau				
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	auding or simplifying ti	ie issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
2. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Edward Urban/	/C. A. H./						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618	Examiner, Art Unit 2618 March 31, 2009						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's arguments regarding the alleged "random[ness] [of] combination" (Applicant's Remarks/Arguments, fifth paragraph), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner has merely looked to a teaching of the various types of smart cards known prior to the time of invention as taught by Chung. Since Benson expressly and explicitly resides in the domain of smart cards (Column 3, Lines 35-36; Benson), such a nod to Benson, under no reasonable standard, can be conveyed as "random." Further in addition to the Applicant's assertion that communicating data over a network is "not obvious" (Applicant's Remarks/Arguments, fifth paragraph), the Examiner maintains it is since Benson explicitly teaches that data originating or terminating from a SIM card maybe be accessed by a network entity (Column 1, Lines 24-59; Benson). In response to the applicant's argument based on "voter anonymity" (Applicant's Remarks/Arguments, Page 11, first paragraph), the argument is moot, as it is out of scope. The Examiner has taken a teaching of multiple types of smart cards for an obvious modification with known predictable results. The column's relied on by the Applicant in support of this reaching argument were not relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly all rejections stand as set forth in the Final Rejection mailed 11/14/2008.